THE

MONTHLY JOURNAL.

VOL. VIII.] BOSTON, MAY, 1867. [No. 4.

EDITOR'S NOTES.

PREACHING IN THE BOSTON THEATRE.

THE officers of the Suffolk Conference have again had occasion to rejoice in the encouragement which has attended their efforts. They engaged the Boston Theatre, the largest auditorium in Boston, for a series of free Sunday-evening religious meetings. Already, as we write, five of these have been held, conducted by Rev. G. H. Hepworth, Rev. Dr. Putnam, and Rev. E. E. Hale. No exciting topics were announced. The discourses were to be simply the presentation, by Unitarian ministers, of lessons of Christian truth and life. Yet rarely has there been assembled in Boston a larger concourse of people than has come to attend these lectures on each successive night. On one of the evenings, twenty minutes before the hour of service, every standing-place was occupied; and the policeman at the door estimated that at least two thousand had already been turned away.

The value of this success does not chiefly consist in the opportunity it has opened for exerting a religious influence on the multitude who attend, but more in the encouragement which comes from it to our whole denominational

work. We have visited recently, or heard from, many places at a distance, and find that this demonstration of life and earnestness, at what is recognized as the centre of our body, has given wonderful encouragement and help wherever the report of it has gone. Somehow, there has been a feeling, that, in Boston, Unitarianism has passed through its period of enthusiasm, and is simply, in a quiet and sober way, to show its ripened fruits. Yet all know that no church can permanently endure and bear its fruits without an ever-fresh renewal of the enthusiasm and earnestness in which its vitality began. And so this assurance of life at the heart has quickened and given confidence to every portion of our body.

CONFERENCE AT NORTHUMBERLAND.

The second meeting of the "Conference of Unitarian and other Christian Churches in the Middle and Southern States" was held in Northumberland, Pa., April 10 and 11. The gathering, of course, was small, seeing that the nearest society belonging to the Conference was a hundred and forty miles away. Yet there were delegates from seven different societies, and from two places where no society has yet been formed; and the generous and refined hospitality of the friends in Northumberland, the lovely scenery, and the bright spring weather, all helped to make it a pleasant occasion. We were so unfortunate as to lose the opening sermon, by Dr. Furness. It was spoken of with great enthusiasm, and it will be published by the Conference. The business session began with reports from the various churches; and, together, they made a very interesting chapter of our ecclesiastical history.

Northumberland, the oldest, founded by Dr. Priestley, —justly enough, proud of its history and prestige, — re-

ported, through its earnest and devoted pastor, Rev. Aaron Porter, some increase during the year. But, besides his ministry there, Mr. Porter had performed missionary service in several places; and he reported, in some of them, very encouraging prospects.

Washington, through Captain John E. Mason, presented a very interesting report. He told how, at the close of the war, the society was utterly prostrate, — the church edifice leased to the Congregationalists, and all hopes for Unitarianism in the city apparently at an end; and then he detailed the story of its re-awakening and its progress, during the last eighteen months, till now every seat in the church is rented; and, not infrequently, even the aisles are filled with attentive hearers. The regular occupants of pews include several members of Congress and their families, and many of the most substantial residents of Washington; and a large number of young men, connected with the various Departments, whose hearty interest has been shown, not only by their attendance, but by active, organized work in the interests of our faith. The transient audience is composed chiefly of strangers from all parts of the country, many of them persons of influence, — some of whom perhaps listen for the first time in their lives to a Unitarian sermon. In connection with this, many interesting instances could be told to illustrate the peculiar importance of this society as a missionary post.

Baltimore was not represented by its pastor; and so, perhaps, the delegate present was more free to tell of the magnificent work which our brother Ware is doing. It is not merely in his immediate parish duties (though there his ministry has been a great success), but his influence has a wider range. He has set on foot various methods

of missionary activity. He has preached in halls in different parts of the city, and has a mission Sunday-school for poor children. He distributes very widely the publications of the Unitarian Association; and has, besides, organized a local publication society, which has issued tracts especially adapted to their immediate wants. Recently, they printed two of his discourses upon the sabbath question, which was then agitating the community. Moreover, Mr. Ware has taken an active share in all the important social, educational, philanthropic movements in the city and State; and, supported by many noble and liberal people in his society, has gained for himself and it a high position among the best forces of the community. He has been especially active in the education of the freedmen. It was pleasant afterwards, in going with him through the streets of Baltimore, to see, as an additional testimony to this part of his work, that he was often recognized by the colored men, and saluted as a friend.

Philadelphia had little to report of outward signs of growth and influence. The society is doing its own work in its own way. The pastor, beloved and admired by his people as few men are, exerts an influence upon them by his preaching and by his life; and has made himself felt in the city, especially by his noble philanthropy, and his firm advocacy of the right. But he utterly disbelieves in the ordinary methods of organized activity. To him, the parable of the leaven in the meal contains the whole theory of spiritual influence in its entire connection with individual responsibility and Christian work. And all this energy and missionary zeal and organized machinery, he considers only a kind of impatience, and an unwillingness to wait for the silent working of influences whose results will be seen in God's own time.

He seems to forget, that, taking his own illustration, in order for the leaven to work, somebody must first take pains to put it in the meal; that Christ himself set the example of organized effort, when he ranged his disciples, and sent them out, two by two, with definite plans; that the whole course of history, in connection with the great reforms and spiritual movements of the world, shows that God has always left even the holiest of causes to human instrumentalities, letting their success rest, just as that of any great enterprise, on the earnestness and intelligent method with which they are pursued; and that there is nothing anywhere to forbid, but every thing to encourage, the employment of the wisdom and ingenious agencies of the children of this world, by the children of the light.

We do not say this by way of criticizing that beautiful ministry of forty years, which is so rich an adornment of our denominational record. Were it only a matter of taste and temperament, we should not even allude to what seems its defect. It is only because its principle is urged as the true theory of the Church and of Christian influence, that we feel bound to say this word by way of protest. In our view, the Christian law of responsibility requires, not merely that our influence be good so far as it goes, but that it be as great as it is in our power to make it; and we offend, as stewards of God's trusts, if, in the efforts to advance his kingdom, we reject, as common or unclean, any agencies (provided they be not contrary to the right) which experience has shown to be effective.

Germantown reported, in a very modest way, through its pastor, a marvellous success. The society is less than two years old, and already has erected a church edifice, costing about thirty thousand dollars, and seating four

hundred people, with every prospect of being steadily filled; and, with all this great work of its own, it has, besides, contributed to the funds of our Association.

One thing which was incidentally told, in connection with the Germantown society, deserves mention, because carefulness in expenditure is as commendable in its way as liberality and earnestness. Not a dollar is paid for music, the choir being composed entirely of members of the society. There are some of our societies that are receiving aid from abroad, and yet pay considerable sums for this feature of their service.

From Vineland, N.J., we had a very encouraging report. That remarkable place has, in five years, been converted from an uninhabited wilderness into a vineyard, with a resident population of nine thousand. The society was started two years ago, and already numbers seventy-five families. They are of various shades of religious opinion, but thoroughly united in purpose, and full of zeal. They have already begun to build a church, and now need only a good pastor in order to make their success complete. The society seems to be largely composed of the New-England siftings of the community; and a stranger among them could hardly realize that he was not in one of our best Massachusetts country towns, were it not that they are all so enamoured of their new home, that they are continually comparing its mild and even climate with the raw, east winds they have left behind. The history of this movement is a good illustration of what energy and faith can do.

Wilmington, Del., is another illustration of the same thing. It is only a year since the first Unitarian preaching was held there; and now the society, though still small, is so established (with a pastor and members

thoroughly earnest and full of faith), that we may look upon its success as assured. They are shortly to begin the erection of a church. The importance of Wilmington, as a place of influence in connection with our faith, is very great; and the prospects of building up there, slowly but surely, a church that shall be a tower of strength to our cause, seem almost certain. A Universalist society has also been started in Wilmington; and, we believe, there is room and work for both.

Besides these established societies, the liberal element in Wilkesbarre and Scranton was represented by delegates from both those places, and encouraging statements were made concerning them; and Rev. Mr. Webster, who has been spending a few weeks in the service of the American Unitarian Association as a missionary in this region, gave a very interesting account of the opportunity he has found.

After these reports, there was a very interesting discussion of some important questions, and a careful consideration of practical work; and, on the last evening, Rev. Mr. Newell gave an admirable address. We have devoted our space, however, to the presentation of the reports, because we think the denomination now is especially interested in its own work; and we believe all will be glad to know the condition of our cause in this section, which is somewhat apart. Since the meeting in Northumberland, we have visited every society that was represented there, and have found these statements amply confirmed.

Everywhere are signs of encouragement and of awakening. One spirit of earnestness seems to pervade them all. We may, in the fullest sense, call it *one* spirit; for nothing is more apparent than the fact, that this un-

usual life that is so manifest in the different societies is a partaking, on the part of each, of the revived fervor and animation that has come over the denomination as a whole. In every place, no matter how retired on one hand or how independent on the other, there was an evident feeling of being a part of one body; and all knew and were stimulated by every item of encouragement in connection with any other part. In short, the best results of the organization that has been aimed at in our denomination seemed already fairly secured; while, at the same time, it was easy enough to see, by the great variety of differences marking the several societies, that there is little enough danger of losing, by any kind of organization, the individuality or independence of the churches. One other thing it may be proper to say in connection with the prosperity of our cause in this section. We have said that it is due in part to the general spirit of earnestness in our body of which it partakes, and that it thus illustrates the value of the co-operative tendency among us. It may be a matter of interest, especially just now when we are raising funds for another year's work of our Association, if we state how far it has been directly aided by our organized instrumentalities.

Of the societies named, four out of the seven have received important, if not essential, assistance from the American Unitarian Association. One half the salary of the minister at Northumberland the past year has been paid by the American Unitarian Association; the society, in consideration of such help, relinquishing him a stipulated portion of the time for missionary work. At Washington, the society resumed its services, after its period of suspension, only on promise of help from the Association; and now, for eighteen months, the entire care of provid-

ing preachers, and the cost of the supply, has rested with the Association; the society itself only entertaining the ministers during their stay, and defraying the incidental expenses of the church. At Vineland, the first movement towards forming a society was made in connection with this Association. For a considerable time, it was kept up, almost wholly, by our sending preachers at the cost of the Association; and the present purpose of building a church has been aided by us through a considerable loan. The Wilmington Society was fostered in a similar manner, and, without the aid of the Association, could hardly have been started. In the beginning, it was a mere experiment; and the individuals at whose solicitation we sent the preachers who helped in its establishment would hardly have ventured upon it (even if they had felt themselves able to support the expense), if they had not had some such body as our Association, on whose support it could rely in case the experiment should develop favorable prospects of success. Since the experimental period has passed, our Association, in conjunction with the society in Baltimore, has paid the largest part of the salary of the minister the first year, and has contributed towards the expense of the proposed church.

Besides this help to the societies, almost all the missionary work that has been done in the limits of this conference has been at the cost of the American Unitarian Association.

We mention this, as we have said, for no other purpose than to illustrate, by the facts in this single locality, what is the work and the opportunity of our Association, as the missionary agency of the denomination. We wish that those who are now considering how much they shall give to the funds of the Association could only look for them-

selves at the service it has been enabled to render there. We believe the money expended is already being repaid by the influence and zeal of the societies aided; while, prospectively, it is hard to estimate the result of planting in that region, till now unused to liberal ideas, these churches of our faith.

INSPIRATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

SECT. 1. — *Question Stated.*

THE question we propose to ask is this: What reason have we for believing that the books of the New Testament (consisting of five histories, twenty-one letters, and one allegorical treatise on future events) were written by men who had received a special illumination from God? What reason is there for believing, that they were *not* written, like other books, by men of genius, industry, and reflection, in the natural exercise of these powers? If thus illuminated, what was the kind of illumination, and what its extent? And, lastly, what kind of authority do these writings possess in consequence? what is their relation to human reason, to Church authority, and to universal experience, — that is, shall we justify the views of the rationalist, the churchman, or the spiritualist?

This is the main question of inspiration, stated distinctly. It divides itself into three: *First*, Is there reason to believe that these Scriptures were composed *under any peculiar inspiration? Second*, What is its character and amount? *Third*, What should be its influence on the formation of our religious belief?

Sect. 2. — *Importance of the Question.*

This question is important, because high views of inspiration tend to produce bibliolatry (Coleridge), or a superstitious reverence for the letter of Scripture; and low views tend to weaken our interest in these writings as sources of positive religious truth. In the formation of opinions also, it is of especial importance to decide the degree of confidence to be placed in the declarations of these Scriptures. To decide what part is human and what divine; what part of these utterances came from the indwelling spirit of truth, and what part from the human limitations of the writers; and by what rule we can distinguish between the divine truth and the human error, ignorance, and prejudice, — this is of primary importance to us in the investigation of Christian truth. This question necessarily precedes all others. In determining the amount of evidence for or against any doctrine of belief or rule of action, we must know what weight to attach to such passages of Scripture as bear upon the doctrine or duty.

Sect. 3 — *State of Opinions concerning Inspiration.*

Upon few subjects of theology are opinions so fluctuating and uncertain as upon this. On one extreme stands the doctrine of inspiration maintained by Gaussen (translated by Edward N. Kirk, D.D.), who asserts that every word contained in the Bible was communicated by inspiration, and contains infallible truth. On the other extreme is the view (represented in this country by the author of the "Discourse of Matters pertaining to Religion"), that the writers of the New Testament were no otherwise inspired than good and wise men always are, and that

their writings are full of errors both of fact and principle. These two doctrines are definite and perfectly intelligible; and, adopting either, we have no difficulty in applying it. Adopt the first, and reason, conscience, observation, experience, must all yield to the letter of Scripture: adopt the second, and you may set aside as puerile, false, or wicked, any assertion or command of Scripture which does not suit your opinions, tastes, or prejudices.

But between these two doctrines there is a vast mass of floating opinion, difficult to define or fix. Some say, the "Bible is not a revelation, but the record of a revelation." Some say, "the thoughts were suggested, but not the words." Others contend for what they call an inspiration of superintendence; that is, the writers were watched, and restrained if they were going astray, — an inspiration like the warnings which Socrates received from his demon, who never told him what to do, but only checked him from doing wrong. Some say, "Parts of the Bible are inspired, others not, — Paul was not inspired to send for his cloak, nor David to curse his enemies." Others say, "There are degrees of inspiration: all parts are inspired, but some in a greater and some in a less degree." Bishop Marsh thinks a man may believe in the truth of the religion who does not believe in the inspiration of the record. Grotius says, "It was not necessary that the historical part of the Bible should be dictated by the Holy Spirit: it was only necessary that the writers should possess a good memory." Marsh thinks we should be gainers, if we considered the evangelists as not inspired at all; for then their testimony would be more valuable as witnesses: but the writers of the Epistles must have been inspired. Some Catholics have contended that the writers of some books were not inspired, but the Holy Spirit made these books Holy Scripture, *after they were*

written, by testifying (through the Church) that there is nothing false in them. Milman thinks that the inflexible love of truth of a true Christian would be a sufficient guarantee of his fidelity as a writer.

The extreme positions of those who contend for a plenary inspiration of every word, and of those who deny all peculiar inspiration, seem to be perfectly intelligible, definite, and clear; but untenable. The positions of those who stand between these points is often more reasonable, but vacillating, and not precise.

The source of this difficulty is twofold: first, in the *method of inquiry* usually pursued; second, in the absence of a precise idea of inspiration in its essential nature.

We will, then, first seek a better method of inquiry; and, second, seek a clear idea of the nature of inspiration.

Sect. 4. — *Method of Inquiry.*

The true inductive method of study is, first, to collect the facts; then, to see what theories will explain them. According to this method, we should ask, —

1st, What are the facts which show that the writers of the New Testament were inspired?

2d, What are the theories of the nature and extent of inspiration, which have been adopted to explain these facts? Are they satisfactory or defective? and, if so, how?

3d, Can a better theory be found?

But the usual method of inquiry has been quite different. Usually, it has been first assumed or argued that some particular kind of inspiration is necessary, in order that our faith should have a sufficient and a firm foundation. Then, the *necessity* of inspiration being established, a *theory* of inspiration is sought which should meet and

satisfy this necessity. Lastly, facts and arguments are sought to establish this theory.

No satisfactory result can be obtained by such a method of inquiry. With what candor or caution can we examine facts, while we believe the whole of Christian faith is in peril, if a certain theory is not established? To assume the truth of a theory on *a priori* grounds, and then look for facts to sustain it, is the sure way to introduce error and falsehood into any branch of knowledge.

The method of Gaussen is still more erroneous and objectionable. He begins by stating the theory of inspiration which he means to defend; namely, that of the plenary verbal inspiration of the whole Bible. He then proceeds to examine the usual objections to this doctrine; thirdly, to refute other theories of inspiration; fourthly, to inquire for the true place and office of sacred criticism; after this, he sums up all his views in the form of a catechism; and, finally, he proceeds to prove them. These proofs occupy about fifty pages at the close of the book, the three hundred previous pages having been devoted to stating his theory, and arguing against the theories of others. Therefore, Lord Bacon's criticism on Aristotle applies exactly to Gaussen: "He had already decided, without having properly consulted experience as the basis of his decisions and axioms; and, having so decided, he drags experiment along as a captive, constrained to accommodate herself to his decisions."

But, before proceeding to test the method which offers better prospects, we will briefly examine the history of the doctrine, which will form the subject of our next section.

Sect. 5. — *History of the Doctrine.*

Before examining a doctrine, it is well to place our minds in an unprejudiced state, by surveying the history of opinions concerning it. We thus command the whole field of inquiry, and lose the narrowness which belongs to those who have only heard one view maintained. When we see how many different forms a doctrine has taken, we cease to be blindly bound to one, and we are better prepared to accept that which shall commend itself as most according to the truth.

1. The ancient religions all taught a plenary inspiration of their prophets, and most of them had their sacred books. The Hindoos believe that the Vedas were given by Brahma; and, after having been preserved by oral tradition for a time, were written down by the wise Vyasa. The Zendavesta declares its substance to have been communicated to Zoroaster by Ormuzd. The Mohammedans maintain that the Koran was communicated to Mohammed, chapter by chapter, from Allah. The Jews believed their law to have been given by Jehovah, through the mediation of angels, to Moses. The Romans regarded with a profound reverence their Sibylline books; and, when they were consulted, the pontifex bowed to them, and did them reverence. The Greeks had no sacred books; but they referred the oracles to an inspiration of the gods, which put thoughts and words together into the mind of the priests. The notion of a plenary inspiration was, therefore, a familiar one to antiquity.

2. The Jews especially believed, not only in the plenary and verbal inspiration of their Scripture, but in the divinity of every letter and mark. Many are the statements in the Talmud to this effect.* For example,

* See Gfrörer, Jahrhundert des Heils.

we read that "the book of Deuteronomy came and prostrated itself before God, and said, 'O Lord of the Universe! in me you have written your law. Behold now, Solomon wishes to remove Yod (from Deut. xvii. 17, 'He shall not multiply wives') from me.' Jehovah answered, 'Solomon, and a thousand like him, shall perish; but a vowel shall not perish from thee.'" Jesus refers to these notions: "Not a jot or a tittle of the law shall pass, till all be fulfilled." (The "jot" or "iota" is the Hebrew *ayin*, the smallest letter of the alphabet; and the "tittle," or *keraia*, is the apex or corner of the letter, such, for instance, as distinguishes *Daleth* from *Resh*. So the Rabbins say, "If any one should change *Daleth* into *Resh*, in Deut. vi. 4, he would shake the universe." It would be changing the word *God* into the word *idol*.)

3. In accordance with these ideas, the Jews have always had a scrupulous care in transcribing their Scriptures. Butler, in his "Horæ Biblicæ," says, "It has been a constant rule with them, that any copy which is considered corrupt shall not be used, but be destroyed. A book is corrupt which wants *one letter*, or has *one too many;* which is written with any thing but ink, or written on parchment made of the skin of an unclean animal, or not purposely prepared for that use, or prepared by any but an Israelite, or on skins tied together by unclean skins. No word shall be written without a line first drawn on the parchment; no word written without being first orally pronounced; before writing the name of God, the pen shall be washed; no letter be joined to another; blank parchment shall be seen round each letter. If any of these rules are not observed, the whole book is corrupt, and must be destroyed.

4. Since the Jews, at the time of Jesus, entertained such a reverence for the letter of their Scriptures, it is no won-

der that a like feeling soon attached itself also to the New Testament. The oldest Church Fathers regarded it as inspired by the Divine Logos, even in the historical parts.* But then, the ante-Nicene Fathers extended this inspiration to heathen writers also.† Tertullian believed every edifying scripture, sacred or profane, to be inspired, reading the famous passage in Timothy, "All scripture, which is profitable for doctrine, &c., is given by inspiration."‡ Among the writings to which a more special inspiration was ascribed, were included the shepherd Hermas and the Sibylline oracles. The oldest writers perceived and felt the difficulty arising from the fact, that the evangelists did not appeal to the Holy Spirit as the source of their knowledge. In the first centuries, therefore, the tendency was strong toward a Platonic view of inspiration, in which the human activity is suppressed, and the writer becomes an unconscious instrument of God. And yet, very inconsistent and fluctuating views prevailed also, some of which leaned toward the opposite extreme of rationalism.

5. The writers of the middle ages continued to think thus variously concerning inspiration down to the Reformation. Hase, Wegscheider, and other writers, quote passages from Abelard and others, in which they speak with contempt of the doctrine of a verbal inspiration. Jerome considered the New Testament full of Hebraisms and solecisms in style. Erasmus, just before the Reformation, said of the writers of the Bible, "They were only men; they were ignorant of some things, they erred in others."

---

* See the evidence in Strauss, "Christliche Glaubenslehre."

† See quotations in Hase, "Dogmatic," from Theoph. Clemens Alex. and Tertullian.

‡ De Cultu Femm. c. 3: "Legimus omnem scripturam ædificationi habilem divinitus inspirari."

6. Luther, a perfectly free mind, showed his independence here as in every thing else. The Scripture he loved as his own life; but he held to no extravagant theory of inspiration. His rule was simple: "To know if a book is inspired, see if it preaches Christ. That which does not, is *not* inspired, though Peter or Paul wrote it; that which does, *is* inspired, though written by Judas, Caiaphas, Pilate, or Herod."

Luther, it is well known, thought the later prophets copied from the earlier; thought some parts of the New Testament had a much higher value than other parts preferred John's Gospel to those of the Synoptics; called James's Epistle "a strawy" one, having more chaff than wheat; and said of one of Paul's arguments in Galatians (iv. 25), that it was "too weak to hold." But just so Jerome had said of another argument in the same epistle (iii. 16), that it had no force, "but yet was good enough for the foolish Galatians." And both Luther and Jerome would nevertheless sometimes argue in the manner of those who hold to the strongest view of plenary inspiration.

7. But, as the Protestant divines now relinquished tradition as a source of truth, and relied wholly on the Bible, it soon became orthodox to believe in the plenary, verbal, literal, and equal inspiration of every part of the canon. The history of the progress of opinions, from this period, becomes so very interesting and important that we shall continue it in our next section.

Sect. 6. — *Later History of the Doctrine.*

We have traced the history of the doctrine to the Reformation. We shall now see, that the inspiration of the Bible, in every word and letter, became a matter of life

and death with Protestant theologians. If we are saved by faith, and if faith means the belief of propositions, then we cannot be saved unless we certainly know what these propositions are. Thus far the Roman Church and the Protestant Church agree: they agree further in asserting the necessity of an external authority, an infallible guide, that we may know what to believe. This infallible guide the Roman Catholic possesses in his Church. The Protestant denies the infallibility of the Church. To him the only infallible guide possible is the Bible. It became inevitable, therefore, for Protestants to assert the infallibility of the Bible.

Protestant theologians, therefore, after Luther, taught that the writers of the Bible were (1) moved by the Holy Spirit to write (*impulsus ad scribendum*); that (2) the topics they were to communicate were given them by the Holy Spirit (*suggestio rerum*); and (3) that the words they chose were pointed out by a like inspiration (*suggestio verborum*). All was inspired, — words and things; history, geography, morality; what they knew before, and what they did not know. The apostolic writers and their assistants were even called "God's amanuenses," and "notaries or secretaries of the Holy Ghost." They said that God used them as tongues to speak with, pens to write with. God, then, is the only author of the Bible; and, if the different books correspond in style and expression to the circumstances of the writers, it is because the Holy Ghost has seen fit to choose such expressions as they themselves would have chosen, if left to themselves.

2. But it had been remarked long since, that all of the Old Testament was not written in pure Hebrew, nor all of the New Testament in pure Greek. Jerome had spoken of barbarisms and solecisms in the Bible; but, according to the new Protestant theory of verbal inspiration, this

would be accusing God of *choosing* barbarous and ungrammatical expressions. Nothing remained but to deny that there were any such, which was accordingly done. The most subtle distinctions and daring assertions were resorted to, and it was boldly denied that any such defects of style were to be found in the Bible.

3. This was not all. Words consist of letters; and, if words are inspired, the letters must be also inspired. But criticism had shown that the Hebrew points or vowels in the Old Testament were not nearly as old as the text, but were added by the Rabbins in later times. Therefore, it was argued, as the consonant is the body, and the vowel the soul, of the word, and the soul as well as body must have come from God, the vowel-points were also inspired; and some of the later symbols (or creeds) roundly declared that they were as old as the consonants.

4. But the dangers to be encountered from criticism were just commencing. Suppose the words were given by inspiration, letters and all, how do we know we have the original words? We have not the original MSS., but only copies of copies; who is to answer for the fidelity and accuracy of the copyist? In fact, the MSS. now extant were found on examination to differ greatly; and Mill, Wetstein, and others discovered tens and hundreds of thousands of variations in words and letters. The teachers of verbal inspiration, therefore, must do one of two things, — they must either assert that some one particular text (the received text for example) was preserved from error by a constant miracle; or the theory must be given up, and the want of infallibility admitted. But they did neither one nor the other, but denied the fact of there being any various readings, or any of consequence, and looked very angrily upon the critics for maintaining the contrary.

5. But criticism, investigation, inquiry, pursue their way, and cannot be checked by bold denials or loud clamors. There are difficulties in the way of the theory of verbal inspiration which cannot be overcome. The eighteenth century was given up to analysis, criticism, and denial; and, among other things, the assertions of the theologians of the seventeenth century were examined and denied. The doctrine of verbal inspiration was gradually but very generally relinquished; but no other theory took its place, and the whole state of opinion became vague and indefinite, as we have shown in a previous section.

As an example of this uncertainty, we may refer to Michaelis, who, in his Introduction to the New Testament (translated by Bishop Marsh), contends that the apostles are inspired, and what they wrote inspired too. "But," says he, "what shall we do with the books *not written by the apostles*, as the Gospels of Mark and Luke?

"I must confess I am unable to find a satisfactory proof of their inspiration; and the more I investigate the subject, and the oftener I compare their writings with those of Matthew and John, the greater are my doubts. In the third edition of this work, I delivered the arguments for and against their inspiration with a degree of uncertainty which side of the question I should prefer, though rather inclined to the affirmative. At present, though I shall deliver my sentiments with the same cautious uncertainty as before, I am strongly inclined to the negative."

So, while our salvation was made to depend on right opinions, and the holding right opinions depended on our having an infallible teacher in the Bible, the most learned theologians of the last century were quite uncertain whether two of the evangelists were inspired or not!

6. At the present time, as we have seen, a very great uncertainty prevails among Protestant theologians upon

this subject. In sermons and exhortations, the Bible is quoted in all its parts as the Word of God, but few define what they mean by this expression. Leading Orthodox theologians in Germany, as Neander and Twesten, decidedly reject the doctrine of verbal inspiration. In England and the United States, many follow Coleridge to the same conclusions.

Sect. 7. — *Proofs of a Special Inspiration.*

The question we have now reached, after our preliminary discussion, is this: "Is there any special or peculiar inspiration to be ascribed to the New-Testament writers? Do these books differ essentially from other products of human genius? What reason have we for thinking that they were more inspired than the writings of Plato, Seneca, Augustine, Zoroaster, or Confucius?"

Let us first define the term "inspiration."

1. We do not say that the writers of the New Testament were inspired *to write books*, but that those books were written by inspired men. It is the man who was inspired, and not the book. Nor is the man inspired as a writer, but as a man. The distinction betweeen revelation and inspiration is modern, and was first made since the Reformation; and is rejected by recent writers of standing, both Orthodox and Liberal.*

2. We do not say that the writers of the New Testament were infallible. Infallibility is one thing, inspiration is another. One may, indeed, be infallibly inspired,

* "Revelation and inspiration are, according to the Scripture, not essentially different. The school theory, therefore, which has prevailed since the seventeenth century, which arbitrarily distinguishes between them, is foreign from the Scripture views." — *Hahn, Lehr. des Christ. Glaub.*, § 24.

but one may also be inspired without being infallible. He may have truth of a higher order set before his mind in a supernatural manner; but in reducing it to thoughts, and reporting it in language, he may mix his own opinions and weaknesses with it.

3. We assert that one may become an *authority* without being infallible. He who has peculiar opportunities of knowledge becomes an authority to others. A traveller from China is an authority (in matters relating to China) to those who have not been there, though no one deems him infallible. Yet wiser men than himself defer to his statements because he has been where they have not been. We may assert that the writers of the New Testament have been where we have not been. We may say that they were placed by an inward influence on a higher plane of insight, so as to see spiritual facts and laws which we do not see.

4. Not that they tell us things never told before. Their statements are as old as truth, as old as humanity. They tell us what has been guessed at, suspected, hoped, and believed, by thousands. But what others have *thought*, they have *seen;* what others report as opinions, they report as facts; what others give as their thoughts, they give as their testimony. They have not opined these things, but have seen and heard them.

5. The evidence of this is to be found, first, in their writings. Taking the undoubted writings of Paul and the other apostles, and neglecting, for the present, the Gospels, we notice that —

6. The *height* and *depth* of their insight indicates a peculiar inspiration. We give a single example, taken at random. When Socrates was condemned to die, a friend said, "What I mourn for, Socrates, is the injustice with which they treat you." — "What!" said Socrates, "would you prefer that I should suffer justly?"

Peter says, in his first Epistle, "It is better, if the will of God be so, that ye suffer for well-doing, rather than for evil doing." — "If ye suffer for righteousness' sake, happy are ye."

We have here the same noble thought uttered by Socrates and by Peter. But Socrates was a man of genius, royally endowed by nature: such as appears only once in many thousand years. Peter was not a man of genius; for we see no evidence of any peculiar natural endowment in him, or in James and John, before the resurrection. Nor do great geniuses go in groups, to be gathered, two or three at a time, out of a crowd of Galilean fishermen. The proof of inspiration is not that these writers say better things than had ever been said before, but *that these unlettered men, rude in intellect and of poor endowment, should be all so changed, by some influence, as that their familiar and extemporaneous speech and writing should abound with the same lofty sentiments and profound thoughts which have been admired and preserved for thousands of years, when uttered in rare moments by the select geniuses of the earth.*

7. The *living harmony of their opinions* indicates a peculiar inspiration.

By studying the ideas and opinions of these writers, we shall see that they have an organic relation to each other. Their minds are penetrated, through and through, by the actual truth; and all their thoughts are polarized by it. In most men we find inconsistency and incoherence. The grasp of thought breaks down somewhere; and some of their opinions are accidental or hereditary, having no binding coherence with the rest. But, in the minds of these writers, all opinions have a moral significance, a relation to central truths. This indicates an interior, organizing principle of life, out of which their thoughts grow. This

coherence cannot in their case come from philosophic reflection, for of this there is no trace: it must come, then, from a living insight; that is, an inspiration.*

8. But it sometimes happens, that narrow men (men of one idea, as we call them) are comparatively consistent in their opinions: they see but one side of truth, and therefore can easily bring all their thoughts into harmony with it. But the New-Testament writers are remarkable for the width of their view, for the range of their thought. They recognize fully all the antagonist facts of the spiritual life. They give both sides of every question. They teach human freedom and divine providence; they teach that salvation is a gift and a reward; they recognize the truths in monotheism and in pantheism, in naturalism and supernaturalism. This breadth of view, which causes their writings to be appealed to by all sects and parties, and to furnish arguments to all schools of thinkers, is a manifest proof that they stood at the centre of spiritual life and light, whence these rays of truth issue in opposite directions.

9. It would confirm our conviction of the fact of their special inspiration, were we to compare the writings of the New Testament with other sacred books, as the writings of Confucius and Mencius, with the Vedas and Puranas, with the Zendavesta and the Koran. The peculiarity of the New Testament would then appear to be a greater clearness, sweep, and depth of insight, but especially a more practical, solid, and substantial character of knowledge.

10. Looking now to see what account these writings themselves give of the inspiration of their writers, we find

---

* To show the truth of the statements in this and the previous paragraphs, many pages would be necessary. But in this direction, we are persuaded, lies the strongest proof of inspiration.

it nowhere asserted that they were inspired to write, but everywhere that they, like all their fellow-disciples, were inspired men.

(*a*) Jesus announces the Holy Spirit which he is to send to lead his disciples into all truth, in John xiv., xv., and xvi.

(*b*) In Acts ii., and elsewhere, we have an account of the coming of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, and of the coming of the same spirit upon all who were baptized, and became Christians.

(*c*) In the Epistles, it is everywhere asserted and assumed, that the whole body of Christians are inspired by the Holy Spirit.

11. The objections urged against this view are mostly against an inspiration of infallibility. It is said that these writers contradict each other in unessential particulars, — that they were ignorant of some things, and mistaken as to others. All this may be, and yet not disprove our assertion, that they possessed a peculiar inspiration, not resulting from natural genius, but from a special divine influence, which placed them on a higher plane of insight, and enabled them to become authorities on matters of religious truth to men wiser than themselves in other respects.

12. In concluding this part of the argument, we say, that, if with the aid of these hints we study the New-Testament writings, we shall find in them a fulness of thought, and be convinced that the Spirit of the Lord has given them a marvellous liberty, fidelity, and insight. And we shall listen to them as to those who have been where we have not been, and seen what we have not seen; and so possess an authority over our wills, which yet is quite different from infallibility.

[To be continued.]

CHRIST, THE SON OF MAN.

BY W. G. ELIOT, D.D.

"I have not spoken of myself; but the Father that sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak." — JOHN xii. 50.

IN my last discourse, we considered Christ's "record of himself," to prove that he claimed the dignity and authority requisite for the office he came to fulfil, in the redemption of the world from sin, and to make known the heavenly Father. It was an easy task, for the Gospels are full of such testimony; and the strength of his expressions is so great, that we do not wonder at their having been interpreted to mean more than was intended by himself. It is always the tendency, in every new religion or philosophy, for the disciples to magnify their master, so as to reflect glory both upon his work and their own. Probably, no instance can be given of an opposite tendency, in the whole history of philosophies and religions, since the world began. Accordingly, we find, in the early preaching of the Apostles, that they were almost at a loss how to express their love and veneration for him whom they had followed for the redemption of Israel. A careful examination of their words would, however, show that they never forgot the difference between the Father and the Son, between the Ambassador and the Sovereign who sends him, between the Mediator who effects the reconciliation, and the infinite Law-giver who establishes the terms of acceptance. In subsequent

ages, this manifest distinction was gradually lost; but it required three full centuries and more to bring the creed of Christendom to its denial. The progress of change may be clearly marked in ecclesiastical history, step by step, from the confession made by Peter and his brethren,— "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,"— to that most wonderful of all human compositions, written in the fifth century, called the Athanasian Creed. Such historical inquiries, however, are difficult and cumbersome. The language of the Apostles themselves, in their letters to the churches, is sometimes indefinite, and frequently hard of interpretation.

We must return, therefore, to Christ himself, as the best, if not the only sure, source of knowledge. The more desirous we are of doing him honor, the more confidently must we rest our faith, at last, upon his own words. We appeal to them therefore, again, in this second part of our argument, as the final and conclusive authority. If he declared a limitation of his nature and attributes, no articles of faith nor ecclesiastical authority, nor ingenuity of argument, can justify us in asserting that such limitation does not exist.

In the first place, we refer to the general tone of Christ's words and intercourse with his disciples to prove the limitations of his nature and authority, in the same manner as we referred to them to prove their elevation and extent. Negatively speaking, this argument is very strong. Try to imagine what would have been the tone and demeanor of one who was conscious of being, in some sense or other, the Infinite God; of one who spoke by his own independent authority, and who possessed, in himself, the attributes of self-existence, omnipresence, and almighty power. I think that your familiarity with the Gospels will show you, at once, how different it would have been from what we

actually read concerning Jesus of Nazareth. Certainly, his disciples, even those nearest to him, did not understand him as asserting the claim of equality with the Father. He was their friend, their kinsman, whom they gradually learned to recognize as the Messiah promised to Israel, and to whom the higher title, "Son of the Living God," could be justly given. But they questioned him with perfect freedom, expostulated with him, and once, at least, rebuked him. One of them betrayed him; all of them forsook him; and, when he was put to death, they thought it was an end of all, and that the hope of Israel was extinguished. They came to embalm his body, and refused to believe the fact of his resurrection until proved to them beyond their power of denial. How can we account for this, if his general intercourse with them, or his words concerning himself, had been those of one claiming for himself the attributes of deity?

But the argument does not rest upon this negative view. If we carefully examine Christ's language, and accompany him in the Gospel history, as he went from place to place, going about to do good, speaking the words of truth, giving the promises of eternal life, the most striking feature in the whole will be his habitual reference of every thing to God the Father. His humility and piety are as remarkable as his tone of authority, and the two traits are inseparable from each other. In his miracles, he appealed to the power of God, as that by which alone he was able to work (John v. 19, 30). He claimed to be heard and believed, because the words that he spoke were not his own, but the Father's who sent him (John vii. 16). His language and conduct were those of an ambassador, who came, not to do his own will, but the will of the Father in heaven. The highest title that he claimed, or permitted to be used concerning him, was "The Son of God;" a title which in

itself clearly implies derivation and dependence, and as clearly is inconsistent with self-existence. In several instances, he distinctly denies the attributes of deity: "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God" (Matt. xix. 17; Mark x. 18). "To sit at my right hand and at my left is not mine to give; but it shall be given to those for whom it is prepared of my Father in heaven" (Matt. xx. 23). "Of that day and hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels of heaven, nor the Son, but the Father" (Mark xiii. 32; Matt. xxiv. 36). Such language may be consistent with very high exaltation; but, if it does not declare limitation and dependence, no words could possibly do so.

There is one fact, however, which pervades the whole life of Jesus, which is to me more forcible than any words could be. I mean the fact that he lived a life of prayer and thanksgiving. He spent whole nights in prayer, and looked up to God, as he taught us to look up, in all times of trial and difficulty. Not only in the beginning of his ministry, but throughout its continuance and at its close, in the Garden of Gethsemane and upon the Cross, he prayed to God as one who absolutely depended upon him, and gave thanks to God for whatever he received or was able to accomplish. (See Heb. v. 7, 8, 9.) How can we reconcile this fact, which no one will deny, with the assertion made by a part of the Christian Church, but never made by Christ himself, of absolute equality with the Father? If in any sense, and by whatever mystery of union, the Divine power was inherent in himself, how would prayer and thanksgiving have been possible? Or should we not be obliged to regard it, as some have done, as an outward show for the sake of the example? It would have been only the seeming of prayer, a self-communion, and not that which it evidently was, the outpouring of his

whole soul, the expression of absolute self-consecration to the Almighty God. "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me! nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt" (Matt. xxvi. 39). "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Matt. xxvii. 46). "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit" (Luke xxiii. 46).

I ask you to observe the peculiar force of this argument, and that it cannot be fairly met by the theory of a double nature in Christ, according to which he was both God and man. For prayer is the most interior of all spiritual experience, and is of necessity addressed to one higher than him who prays. To suppose a twofold consciousness in Christ, one conscious mind *praying* to the other, while the two are indissolubly connected with each other to constitute one person, would be to use language which both Trinitarian and Unitarian disavow, and which is so obscure that no intelligent thought of prayer would remain. He who prays truly and heartily, as Christ evidently prayed, declares the limitation of his whole nature, and the absolute supremacy of the Most High. I desire to treat the opinions of all persons with respect; and we know that some things which seem absurd to us are credible to others, because they see them at a different point of view, so that, perhaps using the same words, they mean a different thing: but I must frankly say, that I cannot comprehend how any one, who believes that Jesus Christ really prayed to God for strength and gave thanks to God for support, can also believe, in any intelligible sense of the words, that Jesus Christ was himself God, self-existent in being, independent in power.

It is not that we object to the word "mystery," or to the idea conveyed by it. To deny the fact of mystery, infinite and inscrutable, would be to stultify one's self. Human arrogance and folly can scarcely go so far. Mystery is the

law and condition of our lives. It is the infinite space which everywhere surrounds us. It is the eternity in which we live. It is the omnipresent power which sustains and directs us, while our conscious freedom is still uncontrolled. Mystery is but another word to express the fact of our ignorance and the limitations of our being. The little that we know is barely enough to indicate the infinity of knowledge and truth beyond us. "It is as high as heaven, what canst thou know? deeper than hell, what canst thou do?" The sphere of our knowledge is very small, compared with that in which faith alone must be our guide.

But we must not deceive ourselves with words. The acknowledgment of mystery does not imply belief in contradictions. If two propositions are contradictory in terms, we may perceive the contradiction, although there may remain a great deal, in the given case, of which we know nothing. If, under the name of mystery, you tell me that two parallel lines, sufficiently produced, will meet and ultimately coincide, or that a part is equal to the whole, you tell me that which is no mystery, and which we require very little knowledge to refute. It is manifestly untrue. And so, in religious inquiry, there are axioms of faith of which we may be just as sure as if we knew every thing. We cannot define the nature of God, nor can we define the nature of Jesus Christ; but if we believe that Christ is a conscious, intelligent, spiritual being, who, according to his own words, derived his being and authority from God, and habitually looked to God the Father, both in prayer and thanksgiving, as the source of all strength and life, we cannot consistently, at the same time, believe that God and Christ are the same being, or that, being different, they are equal to each other. Still less can we assert equality and identity, and the relation of depen-

dence, at one and the same time. The word "mystery" does not cover such inconsistencies of thought. For my own part, in the attempt to reconcile them, I either lose the idea of God in that of Jesus Christ, or the idea of Christ in that of God. But the Bible requires no such confusion of thought; and we prefer to rest in the words of Christ himself: "This is life eternal, to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent" (John xvii. 3); words which were uttered in prayer, at a time when his earthly ministry was almost finished.

We have already alluded to the usual method of avoiding the argument now presented. A twofold nature is claimed for Jesus Christ, by which he was perfect God and perfect man at the same time. But there are two reasons why this answer fails, even if we are able to attach an intelligible meaning to it. In the first place, it is not asserted that Jesus had a double consciousness; for, on the contrary, unity of person and of consciousness is claimed for him. He must have spoken, therefore, and thought and acted at each particular time, as an individual. When he said "I" and "me," he must have meant *himself*, as he actually was when speaking, in his whole being. He was so understood and gave no intimation whatever of meaning any thing else. To assert that he spoke sometimes in one nature and sometimes in another, without giving intimation how he was to be understood; and, still more, that, in the same conversations, he alternated from one to the other, without explanation, — would be equivalent to asserting that we cannot understand him at all. The supposition is inconsistent with the plainness, simplicity, and truthfulness of Christ's words; and no teacher of religious truth would consent to such a rule of equivocal and ambiguous instruction. When Jesus said, "My Father is greater than I" (John xiv. 28); and again, "I ascend to my

Father and your Father, to my God and your God" (John xx. 17); and again, "I can do nothing of myself" (John v. 30), — which was his common method of speaking, — there is but one fair and just mode of interpretation. We have no right to interpret the Bible by rules of criticism which would change any other book into prevarication and falsehood.

For another reason, the theory of a double nature fails in its purpose. Taking Christ's own language as our guide, the passages in which he claims the highest and most mysterious exaltation, and which therefore must refer to his highest nature, whatever it may be, are the same in which he most distinctly asserts the limitation both of authority and being. For example, the words, "No man knoweth the Son but the Father, and no man knoweth the Father but the Son" (Matt. xi. 27), — indicate an intimacy and exclusiveness of communion greater perhaps than anywhere else expressed. But they are immediately preceded by the words, "All things are delivered unto me of my Father," and by thanksgiving to God, by whom this elevation, however great, had been conferred: "I thank thee, O Father! Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes." He speaks of the glory in which he was to come, as "the glory of his Father." In the judgment scene, when he represents himself as the King, he says, "Come, ye blessed of my Father" (Matt. xxv. 34). When asserting his power to overthrow his enemies, he said, "Think ye not that I could pray to my Father, and he would give me twelve legions of angels?" (Matt. xxvi. 53). Before the judgment-seat of Pilate, when asserting his own future triumph, he still speaks of delegated authority: "The Son of man shall sit on the right hand of power" (Matt. xxvi. 64). When he said, "All

power is given to me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. xxviii. 18), the words contain their own limitation, in the word "given," which implies a superior from whom the power is received, and makes it consistent with the special limitations of authority and power elsewhere expressed by Jesus himself. When Jesus said, "Glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was" (John xvii. 5), we must not forget that they are words of prayer to God the Father.

I confidently challenge the Bible student to adduce a single passage of Scripture, where Christ speaks of himself in this exalted tone of authority and divine communion, in which he does not with equal distinctness declare that he spoke and worked and lived by the will and power of him whom he uniformly declared to be the only true God, the infinite and almighty Father.

But even if there were exceptions, and if we found general declarations of authority or power without limitation expressed at the same time, they would give us no embarrassment; for this is the peculiar force of the argument we are now using, that a particular negation, at any one time, has the effect of limiting all general expressions upon the same subject. Thus, if I were to say that a dictator has absolute control of all the affairs of the nation, and were to repeat the assertion a hundred times, with ever so strong language, but were to introduce a single sentence declaring that he has no control over religious affairs or over the domestic relations of society, that one expression of limitation would cover the whole ground, and modify the whole statement. It would be no longer an absolute dictatorship, but one with limited powers.

Again, although no such special limitation was directly spoken of, it might be as clearly and distinctly expressed by reference to a higher authority, as that under which all

the power possessed is exercised. Thus, if we should speak of a dictatorship established by the people, with absolute powers, it would not be understood as independent of the authority by which created; but, on the contrary, as restrained, and subject to discontinuance by the same power which established it. If that responsibility and ultimate obedience were denied, the dictatorship would become a usurpation, and the republic would be destroyed. However unlimited within a certain range of action, the higher authority still remains and must be acknowledged; and its acknowledgment is in itself the clearest expression of limitation and dependence. No statement of delegated powers can convey the force of independent supremacy.

You will perceive how closely this bears upon the subject in hand. Christ always refers directly to God the Father as the source of all his authority. He claimed to be heard and obeyed, because he spake what he had been commanded to speak, — as when he said, "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son" (John v. 22). And again, when he claimed the power of raising the dead, in one of the most remarkable passages of the Bible, he says, "For, as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself, and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man" (John v. 26, 27). Is it not strange that this same language is quoted to prove the self-existence of Christ? If he has "life in himself," it is argued, and if, as said just before, "he giveth life to whom he will," does not that imply self-existence and independent power? not observing, apparently, that the same sentence declares the source both of the power and the life, and the reason for their being given. "The Father hath given to the Son to have life in himself" is a denial of self-existence, not its assertion. "The Father

hath given him authority to execute judgment" is a denial of independent power, however great that power may be. Accordingly, we find, in the same conversation, and only two verses later, the following sentence: "I can of mine own self do nothing; as I hear I judge, and my judgment is just, because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me" (John v. 30).

We contend that there is no passage in the Scripture where Christ claims higher exaltation, both of nature and of office, than in this which we have now considered, in which we find such clear and unequivocal declaration of *derived* existence and *limited* authority. If such language, under such circumstances, can be set aside, I do not see how it would have been possible for Christ to have guarded himself from misconstruction. If those words do not express limitation and dependence, then no words whatever could have done it.

Let me remind you that I am arguing only to a single point; namely, the fact of limitation. We are not speaking of degrees of exaltation, nor denying any thing short of the Infinite and Supreme. That would be a matter of subsequent inquiry, comparatively insignificant in importance. However exalted the nature and authority of Christ, so long as the fact of derivation and dependence is admitted, as he himself declared it, the difference between finite and infinite remains, with the absolute supremacy of the Father, whom he made known to us as "the only true God." Such is evidently the argument of the Apostle Paul, whose language concerning Christ is often misunderstood. In the midst of his most glowing language, speaking of Christ's kingdom, "when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power," he adds these final and conclusive words: "But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that He is excepted, which did

put all things under him; and when all things shall be subdued under him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto Him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all" (1 Cor. xv. 28).

We conclude, therefore, that Jesus did not assert for himself the supremacy of nature and attributes which subsequent times asserted for him, but that he distinctly and uniformly declared the fact of derivation, of limitation, of dependence. He was the Son of God, and declared to be so, with power to make known the will of God, to manifest the character of God, to reconcile the world to God; but in all he was the messenger of God's love, who came forth from the Father to do and to speak whatever his Father commanded him. They are his own words, and we can find no authority for going beyond them. We prove our allegiance to Christ himself by thus receiving him. We stand up for Jesus by refusing to add any thing to his testimony. We honor the Son as we honor the Father, by accepting the words of Christ concerning the Father and concerning himself. We repeat them, and would write them all over our Church and upon the living tablets of our hearts: "This is life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent."

CREEDS AND COVENANTS.

Our Pilgrim Fathers, true to their principles of religious liberty; true to the parting charge of their pastor when they embarked from Holland, that they should watch for the new light which was yet to break from God's word, —associated themselves into churches, not upon the basis of creeds, but of covenants. I have a copy of the covenant of the first church in Plymouth, the church of the "Mayflower;" and it is such that we could heartily adopt it as our own. Our church, which was gathered here one hundred and sixteen years ago, was organized on the same basis. We still wish to hold to their ancient freedom of opinion: we would cast not a single barrier in the way of the earnest inquirer. It is true, we unite upon profession of faith in Christ. This is, of course, essential. Ours is a religious society, whose basis is not the Koran or the Zendavesta, but the gospel of Christ. It is a Christian society. Further than that, we would not define our opinions. We have no purpose of fencing ourselves in; imprisoning our souls within the damp, ancient walls of creeds, whence we can only look out on the sunshine of God's truth fearfully, lest we may see too much from the grated windows. We bind ourselves to no dogma; we put no shackles upon freedom of thought. We are Christians, it is true; but we may be Unitarians, Calvinists, Methodists, or Universalists, in our minor doctrines, and yet, under all these varying forms of belief, have the "unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace." Though differing widely in our intellectual belief, as I know we do, we yet are willing together, as a band of brothers, to pursue what is of more value than any dogma, and exists in the earnest spirit under every creed, the Christian life. God be thanked that men can no more fence into their enclosures the Christian spirit, than they can the free air and the sunshine of heaven. — *Samuel Abbott Smith.*

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

The annual meeting of the American Unitarian Association will be held on Tuesday, May 28. The following plan is proposed by the Committee of Arrangements : —

The business meeting will be at Hollis-street Church, at nine o'clock, A.M. At this meeting, the usual reports will be presented ; the officers for the ensuing year will be chosen ; the amendments to the constitution, proposed last year by Rev. Dr. Stebbins, will be acted on ; and any other business attended to that may properly come before the Association.

After this there will be a free discussion of topics to be introduced by the Report of the Executive Committee, or of any other topics that may be presented ; and it is hoped that the opportunity thus offered, for considering vital interests of the denomination, will insure an earnest and profitable meeting. It is hoped that a large gathering may attend. On the evening of the same day, the meeting of the Association will be continued in the Music Hall, where addresses may be expected from various speakers.

This arrangement has been made by agreement with the Committee on the Festival, who have deferred that occasion to Thursday.

We print, for the information of the members of the Association, the proposed amendments, which are to be acted on Tuesday morning : —

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS IN THE BY-LAWS OF THE AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

Article 3. — The administration of the affairs of the corporation shall be in the hands of an Executive Committee, con-

sisting of eighteen members, six of whom, at least, shall be laymen, to be chosen by ballot at the annual meeting; and shall hold their offices for three years, or till others be chosen in their stead: *provided*, that, after the first election of the committee (1867), the members thereof shall be divided into three divisions, of six members each, by casting lots, the divisions to serve one, two, and three years respectively, as the lot shall decide; and thereafter only one third, or six members of the Executive Committee, shall be chosen annually.

ARTICLE 4. — It shall be the duty of the Executive Committee, at the first meeting of the Board, after the annual meeting of the corporation, to choose a president, two vice-presidents, a secretary, when judged necessary, an assistant-secretary, and a treasurer, who shall be *ex officio* members of the Executive Committee. This committee shall meet at least once in each month, six constituting a quorum; and shall have charge of all the business interests of the Association, the direction of its funds and operations, with power to fill any vacancies that may occur in their number (the appointee to hold office until the next meeting of the Association); and to call special meetings of the corporation, whenever they shall deem it necessary or expedient.

ARTICLE 5. — [After the words "sphere of its influence" go on thus: —] and the assistant-secretary shall render such service as shall be specified by the Executive Committee. The salaries of the secretaries shall be determined annually, by a majority vote of all the members of the Executive Committee, the secretaries not voting.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

[All books received will be promptly acknowledged, and notices will be given of such as are appropriately reviewed in a religious journal.]

American Leaves: Notes of Thought and Life. By SAMUEL OSGOOD. New York: Harper & Brothers.

This volume is chiefly made up of articles contributed by Dr. Osgood to "Harper's Monthly;" and our first impression,

on reading them, is that of satisfaction that such articles, so full of solid truth and earnest teaching, can meet the want and please the taste that is aimed at by a popular magazine. It speaks well for the average sentiment of our people. The subjects are varied, but all of them truly practical, and well chosen for conveying the lessons best suited to American life. The style is fresh and attractive; and the wise suggestions are set off and enforced by vigorous argument and copious illlustration, so as to insure the interest of the reader.

We are glad to announce, that, in response to the request of some persons who believed that they would do much good if widely circulated, two of the chapters — those on "American Boys" and "American Girls" — have been printed separately, and are on sale at the Rooms of the American Unitarian Association.

The volume itself may also be procured at these rooms. — ED.

Dickens's Works: David Copperfield. Boston: Ticknor & Fields.

To our mind, this is the most satisfactory of the series. The illustrations are capital.

Ecce Deus. Boston: Roberts Brothers. For sale by H. B. Fuller.

It was a hazardous thing for the author of this volume to adopt, for its title, one which connects it with a book so remarkable as "Ecce Homo." It both challenges comparison with that, and, at the same time, excites a prejudice in the public mind, as being a device to obtain readers through the influence of another's reputation. As compared with "Ecce Homo," the book is poor; it lacks the clearness of statement, delicacy of thought, and purity of tone, which so marked that volume. It avows and supports, by very flimsy argument, in the first few chapters, the most untenable theory of the nature of Christ, and is, throughout, superficial and crude. But it is by no means wanting in ability or in attractiveness. It has many bright suggestions, and bears evidence of considerable acquaintance with the best liberal thought. ED.

God's Word Written. By Rev. EDWARD GARBETT, M.A. Boston: American Tract Society.

This is a full and careful statement and defence of the Orthodox doctrine of Inspiration. It was originally published by the London Religious Tract Society, and is now republished by the American Tract Society. It is very useful to have so recent a statement thus indorsed, as a standard for judging the present views of the Orthodox church on this important sub-

ject. This volume, taken together with the little treatise on the same subject, of which a portion is given in the present number of this Journal, will afford the inquirer ample means of understanding both sides. ED.

Back-Bone. Photographed from "the Scalpel." By EDWARD H. DIXON, M.D. New York: Robert M. De Witt. Sold in Boston by Lee & Shepard.

A series of essays on subjects connected with a physician's experience; bright and varied, though somewhat marred by egotism and extravagance. ED.

Sermons. By E. B. Hall, D.D. With a brief memoir. Boston: W. V. Spencer.

This volume comes just as the Journal goes to press, and we can only express our cordial welcome, sure that we shall derive from it rich satisfaction and edification. ED.

The Little Barefoot. By BERTHOLD AUERBACH. Translated by Eliza Buckminster Lee. Illustrated. Boston: H. B. Fuller & Co.

A delightful book; not specially for the young, as we thought when we took it up, but for any who enjoy well-drawn characters, and a story beautifully told. ED.

NOTE.

IN the last number of the "Journal," in a notice of the meeting in Nashua, we called it a meeting of the "New-Hampshire Local Conference." There is, as yet, no such body. The meeting was of the officers of the "New-Hampshire Unitarian Association."

MEETINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

April 15, 1867. — Present, Messrs. Palfrey, Kidder, Smith, Fay, Livermore, Crosby, and Fox.

The Committee on Publications presented a report, which

stated that books had been granted, in response to applications received, to the Athenæum Library Association, Minneapolis, Minn., and the Parish Library of the Unitarian Society in Charleston, S.C.

The report also contained the following recommendations, all of which were adopted: —

1. That one hundred dollars worth of the Association's publications should be given to Rev. Frederic Huidekoper, of Meadville, Penn., to be distributed by him, as were those given last year, to ministers of other denominations.

2. That there should be purchased of the publishers of Rev. Dr. Osgood's recent work, entitled "American Leaves," one thousand copies, in tract form, of the chapters on "American Boys" and "American Girls."

3. That the Publication Committee should be authorized to proceed at once to stereotype and publish Mr. C. E. Norton's abridgment of his father's work on the "Genuineness of the Gospels," prepared by request of the Executive Committee.

4. That they should be authorized to issue new editions of "Orthodoxy: its Truths and Errors," and Ware's "Formation of the Christian Character."

The Committee on the New-England States presented a report, in which they recommended that the sum of $100 should be appropriated to the Society in Brooklyn, Conn., to aid them in sustaining preaching; and $500 towards the salary and expenses, for another year, of Rev. A. D. Wheeler, D.D., as missionary in the State of Maine, the Maine Conference to appropriate, as before, an equal amount; and the report was adopted.

The Committee on the Western States reported in favor of an appropriation of $500, for purposes of general missionary work in the West, to be expended under the direction of the Western-States Committee; which report was adopted.

The Committee on Theological Education presented a report, in which an appropriation of $50, from the Perkins Fund, was recommended to a student in the Cambridge Divinity School, from whom an application had been received; and the recommendation was adopted.

A communication from the Secretary was read, suggesting, that the amendment to the By-laws of the Association, submitted at the last annual meeting by Rev. Dr. Stebbins, and referred to the Executive Committee for consideration, should be discussed at the present meeting, or, if deemed preferable, be referred to a committee, to be reported upon at the next regular meeting.

It was decided to adopt the latter course and a committee was appointed, consisting of the Secretary and Messrs. Willson and Sawyer.

The Board then adjourned to Monday, May 13.

INTELLIGENCE.

THE CHILDREN'S MISSION-HOME, the building erected on Tremont Street, Boston, by the Children's Mission to the Children of the Destitute, for the various purposes of that mission, was dedicated on Wednesday, March 27; the services being held in the chapel. The order of exercises was as follows: Introductory prayer by Rev. Edward E. Hale, of the South Congregational Society, Boston; reading from the Scriptures by Rev. Rufus Ellis, of the First Society; remarks by Hon. Albert Fearing, the President of the Mission, and Mr. George Merrill, the Secretary; dedicatory prayer by Rev. Edward J. Young, of Newton Corner; sermon by Rev. George L. Chaney, of Hollis-street Society, Boston; remarks by various gentlemen; benediction.

Rev. JEFFERSON M. FOX was installed as pastor of the Society in Harvard, Mass, on Wednesday, March 27. The order of services was as follows: Invocation by Rev. Josiah K. Waite, of Groton Junction; reading from the Scriptures by Rev. Willard Spaulding (Universalist), of Salem; sermon by Rev. Richard Metcalf, of Winchester; installing prayer by Rev. Rush R. Shippen, of Worcester; charge by Rev. George M. Bartol, of Lancaster; right hand of fellowship by Rev. John Green, of Leominster; address to the people by Rev. Henry

H. Barber, of Somerville; closing prayer by Rev. Willard Spaulding; benediction by the pastor.

The Fortieth Anniversary of the settlement of Rev. Alonzo Hill, D.D., as pastor of the Second Parish (Unitarian), Worcester, was celebrated on Thursday, March 28. Religious services were held in the church, at eleven o'clock, A.M., the order being as follows: Reading from the Scriptures by Rev. Rush R. Shippen, of the Church of the Unity, Worcester; introductory prayer by Rev. James W. Thompson, D.D., of Jamaica Plain; sermon by Rev. Dr. Hill; concluding prayer by Rev. Chandler Robbins, D.D., of Boston. The services in the church were followed by a collation in the vestry, at which Hon. Stephen Salisbury, of Worcester, presided, and addresses were made by Hon. Phineas Ball, of Worcester; Rev. Dr. Hill; Rev. George M. Bartol, of Lancaster; Rev. Rush R. Shippen; Hon. Harvey Chapin, of Worcester; ex-Governor Washburn, of Cambridge; Rev. Dr. Robbins; and Rev. Dr. Sweetzer and Rev. Mr. Richardson, pastors of Orthodox societies in Worcester.

Rev. George W. Briggs, D.D., was installed as pastor of the First Unitarian Society, at Cambridgeport, Mass., on Wednesday evening, April 3. The order of services was as follows: Introductory prayer by Rev. Henry C. Badger, of Boston; reading from the Scriptures by Rev. Abram W. Stevens, of the Lee-street Church, Cambridgeport; sermon by Rev. Frederic H. Hedge, D.D., of Brookline; right hand of fellowship by Rev. William Newell, D.D., of Cambridge; benediction by the pastor.

The Fortieth Anniversary of the Benevolent Fraternity of Churches, in Boston, was celebrated at the Hollis-street Church, on the evening of Fast Day, April 4. Rev. William P. Tilden offered the introductory prayer; and addresses were made by Rev. Chandler Robbins, D.D., President of the Fraternity, and by Rev. Samuel H. Winkley, Rev. Ezra S. Gannett, D.D., Rev. George H. Hepworth, Rev. Samuel K. Lothrop, D.D., and Rev. Edward E. Hale.

THE CORNER-STONE of the new house of worship, to be erected by the First Church in Boston, at the corner of Berkeley and Marlboro' Streets, was laid on Thursday (Fast Day), April 4. The services were as follows: After the meeting had been called to order by Thomas B. Wales, Esq., Chairman of the Standing Committee, the Chairman of the Building Committee, Hon. G. W. Messinger, made an appropriate statement. Rev. Rufus Ellis, pastor of the society, then read an account of the contents of the box, to be placed under the stone; after which he read appropriate passages from the Scriptures, and, in a few fitting words, pronounced the stone laid. After a prayer, offered by Rev. Ezra S. Gannett, D.D., of the Arlington-street Society, Mr. Ellis delivered an address, at its close reading a hymn, written for the occasion, by Rev. Nathaniel L. Frothingham, D.D., for many years pastor of the society. The services closed with the singing of the Doxology, and the benediction.

Mr. JOHN WILLIAMS, who for some time past has been engaged in missionary work at the South End, Boston, was ordained to the work of the Christian ministry, on Sunday evening, April 7; the services being held at the South Congregational Church. The order of exercises was as follows: Invocation by Rev. William Ellery Copeland, of Brunswick, Me.; reading from the Scriptures by Rev. Samuel B. Cruft, of Boston; sermon by Rev. William P. Tilden, of Boston; prayer of consecration and charge by Rev. Edward E. Hale, of the South Congregational Church; right hand of fellowship by Rev. Samuel H. Winkley, of Pitts-street Chapel; concluding prayer by Rev. Almanza S. Ryder, of South Boston.

THE PLYMOUTH AND BAY CONFERENCE held its first meeting since its organization, at Quincy, Mass., on Tuesday, April 9. The Secretary, Rev. William H. Fish, of South Scituate, presented a brief report relating to the object of the Conference; and Rev. Leonard J. Livermore, one of the Executive Committee of the American Unitarian Association, made, by invitation, a statement of what were the views of that organization respecting its relations to the Local Conferences. Reports from the several societies connected with the Conference followed,

after which a discussion took place concerning the ways and means for missionary work; and votes were passed securing attention to points offering useful opportunities for such work, within the limits of the Conference, and, at the same time securing a hearty co-operation in the broader work of the American Unitarian Association.

Mr. Henry F. Jenks was ordained as pastor of the first Parish in Fitchburg, Mass., on Wednesday, April 10. The order of services was as follows: Introductory prayer by Rev. Rush R. Shippen, of Worcester; selections from the Scriptures by Rev. John B. Green, of Leominster; sermon by Rev. Andrew P. Peabody, D.D., of Cambridge; ordaining prayer by Rev. Samuel K. Lothrop, D.D., of Boston; charge by Rev. Chandler Robbins, D.D., of Boston; right hand of fellowship by Rev. Charles E. Grinnell, of Lowell; address to the people by Rev. Calvin Lincoln, of Hingham; concluding prayer by Rev. William P. Tilden, of Boston; benediction by the pastor.

The Middle and Southern-States Conference held its second meeting at Northumberland, Penn., on Wednesday and Thursday, April 10 and 11. Sermons were preached by Rev. William H. Furness, D.D., of Philadelphia; and Rev. William W. Newell, of Germantown, Penn. The Secretary of the American Unitarian Association was present, and addressed the Conference in its behalf; after which resolutions were adopted, pledging the Conference to co-operate with the Association, and asking of it a missionary for six-months' service, within the limits of the Conference.

The North-Middlesex Conference held its first regular meeting at Groton, Mass., Thursday, April 11. An address on "missionary work" was delivered by Rev. Rufus P. Stebbins, D.D., of Cambridge.

The following resolutions, presented by Rev. J. K. Waite, of Groton Junction, were unanimously adopted: —

Resolved, That recognizing the spirit of Christianity as aggressive, it is the duty of its confessors practically to adopt the missionary enter-

prise as a legitimate demand of their faith, as they have ability and opportunity.

Resolved, That this Conference recommend to the American Unitarian Association the appointment of some one to do missionary service; and report his doings, as such, at the meetings of this Conference, and also to the Secretary of the American Unitarian Association, on or before the first day in May annually.

It was voted, that the clergymen of the several societies should call the attention of their people to the importance of raising money to carry out the objects of the Conference; and the respective parishes were requested to appoint a Finance Committee, to assist in the raising and collection of the needed funds.

The New-York Liberal-Christian Union held its first public meeting in the Church of the Messiah, New York, on Monday evening, April 15. Remarks were made by the President, Hon. Richard Warren, and by Rev. Samuel Osgood, D.D., Rev. O. B. Frothingham, Rev. Henry W. Bellows, D.D. (Unitarians) and Rev. E. H. Chapin, D.D., Rev. D. K. Lee, and Rev. G. L. Demorest (Universalists).

The Channing Conference was organized at Providence, R.I., on Wednesday, April 17; a constitution being adopted, the first article of which was as follows: —

"The Churches of the Unitarian faith in the County of Bristol, Mass., and the States of Rhode Island and Connecticut, and such others as may assent to this constitution, are hereby organized into an association, to be known as the "Channing Conference."

The following officers were chosen: —

President — His Excellency Ambrose E. Burnside, of Providence.
Vice-President — Timothy Gordon, of Taunton.
Secretary — Rev. Charles W. Buck, of Fall River.
Treasurer — Hon. Seth Padelford, of Providence.
Committee on Christian Work — Rev. Augustus Woodbury, of Providence; John T. Bush, of Newport; Mrs. Amelia F. Southgate, of Taunton; Mrs. Dr. Hooper, of Fall River; Rev. D. S. C. M. Potter, of Norton.
Committee on Sunday Schools — Alfred Stone, of Providence, Rev. George W. Stacy, of Mansfield; Miss Nancy Talbot, of Dighton; Mrs. Charles W. Buck, of Fall River; Mrs. Joseph Weaver, of Newport.

Committee on Christian Fellowship and Denominational Action — Rev. C. Y. De Normandie, of Fairhaven, Mass.; Rev. E. M. Stone, of Providence; William Cobb, of Dighton; Thomas T. Potter, of Fall River, Joseph Dean, of Taunton.

Committee on Theological Education and Ministerial Support — Hon. T. D. Eliot, of New Bedford; Rev. Charles T. Brooks, of Newport; Rev. C. W. Buck, of Fall River; Job C. Tripp, of Fairhaven, Mass.; William B. Weeden, of Providence.

Addresses were made by Rev. George H. Hepworth, of Boston; Rev. Charles C. Everett, of Bangor, Me., and others; and various motions were passed defining the duties of the several committees; after which the Conference adjourned to meet at the call of the Executive Committee.

The First Congregational Society in Providence, R.I., having erected in their church a tablet to the memory of their late pastor, Rev. Edward B. Hall, D.D., held a commemorative service on the evening of Wednesday, April 17. The exercises were as follows: Reading from the Scriptures by Rev. Edwin M. Stone, of Providence; prayer by Rev. Augustus Woodbury, of Providence; addresses on the character and labors of Dr. Hall, by Rev. Frederic H. Hedge, D.D., of Brookline, Mass.; Rev. Charles C. Everett, of Bangor, Me.; and Rev. James Freeman Clarke, D.D., of Boston.

The tablet bears the following inscription: —

Erected
By the First Congregational Society,
To the memory of
Rev. Edward B. Hall, D.D.,
Their beloved pastor,
Installed Nov. 14, 1832.
Died March 3, 1866, æt. 65.

The New Church built by the Unitarian Society in Germantown, Penn., was dedicated on the afternoon of Wednesday, April 17. Rev. William Newell, D.D., of Cambridge, Mass., offered the introductory prayer, and read selections from the Scriptures; the prayer of dedication was offered by Rev. William H. Furness, D.D., of Philadelphia; and addresses were

made by Mr. William W. Newell; Rev. Dr. Furness; Rev. L. L. Briggs (Universalist), of Philadelphia; and Rev. Henry W. Bellows, D.D., of New York.

Mr. William W. Newell was ordained as pastor of the Society in Germantown, Penn., on the evening of Wednesday, April 17. The sermon was preached by Rev. Henry W. Bellows, D.D., of New York; Rev. William Newell, D.D., of Cambridge, Mass., offered the ordaining prayer; Rev. Edward E. Hale, of Boston, gave the charge to the minister and the address to the people; and Rev. Charles A. Humphreys, of Springfield, Mass., the right hand of fellowship.

Rev. Eli Fay has declined the call from the society in Washington, D.C.

Rev. John B. Green has resigned the charge of the society in Leominster, Mass.

Rev. Edward W. Hathaway has accepted an invitation to take charge of the society in Princeton, Ill., for three months.

Mr. Haskett D. Catlin has accepted a call from the Neponset Society, Dorchester, Mass.

Rev. George F. Piper has accepted an invitation to take charge of the society in Canton, Mass., for four months.

Rev. Edward I. Galvin has resigned the charge of the society in Brookfield, Mass.

Rev. George Dexter has accepted an invitation to take charge of the society in Brewster, Mass.

Rev. Junius L. Hatch has resigned the charge of the society in Dighton, Mass.

The Suffolk Conference of Unitarian and other Christian Churches opened the Boston Theatre, in Boston, for preaching on Sunday evening, March 24. Rev. George H. Hepworth, of Boston, was the preacher on that occasion and, on the two following Sundays; Rev. George Putnam, D.D., of Roxbury, preached April 14; Rev. Edward E. Hale, of Boston,

the 21st; and Rev. Henry W. Bellows, D.D., of New York, the 28th; and Rev. Robert Collyer, of Chicago, Ill., it is expected, will be the preacher the two following Sundays. The Theatre has been crowded to its utmost capacity on each occasion.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

1867.			
March 23.	From	Samuel Appleton and R. H. Green, as annual memberships	$2.00
25.	„	Little, Brown, & Co., Boston	100.00
26.	„	a Friend in Andover	3.00
27.	„	Hollis-street Society, Boston	1,400.00
27.	„	William Wightman, St. Louis, Mo., for India Mission	10.00
April 1.	„	Young Men's Liberal-Christian Association, North Woburn	10.35
1.	„	Society in North Cambridge	23.61
2.	„	Mrs. Mary Per Lee, Norwich, N.Y., to make herself a life-member	30.00
2.	„	Society in Hampton Falls, N.H., for Monthly Journals	10.00
3.	„	George E. Baker, Washington, D.C., to make himself a life-member	30.00
3.	„	Charles Richardson, as an annual membership	1.00
5.	„	First Parish, Portland, Me., for Monthly Journals	55.00
5.	„	Rev. A. W. Stevens, as an annual membership	1.00
8.	„	Rev. Henry Westcott, as an annual membership	1.00
8.	„	Teachers in First Congregational Sunday School, Providence, R.I.; "a thank offering for Tracts"	10.00
10.	„	South Congregational Society, Boston	2,400.00
11.	„	Society in Augusta, Me.	22.70
11.	„	Charles Du Bois, as an annual membership	1.00
15.	„	Rev. Edward J. Young's Society, Newton	775.00
15.	„	"E. G.," Philadelphia, Penn.	10.00
17.	„	First Parish, Portland, Me., for Monthly Journals, additional	30.00
17.	„	Society in Peterboro', N.H.	52 00
19.	„	J. T. Cotton, Southboro'	10.00